

475
P

Mr.

Mr. D
physical s
the First
and if th
resist su
as an s
prepared
earliest, c
propose t
Speaker :
addressed
hours, bu
that I sh
trust to y
or three, c
which I s
thelaw an
had a spe
of Railwa
statement
have had
hon. mer
Blake).
the hon.
cheering
plete with
fidence in
will be un
whole of
Railway,
Railways
to the H
refer to t
system c
Pacific O
I will dir

hys C.R.P. Hon R. Beaven
Victims 186

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

SPEECH DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

—BY—

Mr. AMOR DeCOSMOS, M.P.,

—ON—

FRIDAY and MONDAY, 16th and 19th APRIL, 1880.

(From the Official Report of the Debates.)

Mr. DeCOSMOS: I have as much physical strength, I dare say, as the hon. the First Minister has, and perhaps more; and if the Government are prepared to resist such a reasonable proposition as an adjournment, they must be prepared to sit here till, at the earliest, eight o'clock in the morning. I propose to discuss this question, Mr. Speaker: I would have preferred to have addressed the House within reasonable hours, but as it is the will of this House that I shall not have that privilege, I trust to your indulgence possibly for two, or three, or four, or perhaps more hours, in which I shall speak, in accordance with the law and usage of Parliament. We have had a speech from the hon. the Minister of Railways, in which he made his annual statement on the Pacific Railway; and we have had also the annual review from the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). I may say that the speech of the hon. the Minister of Railways was cheering; it was full of energy and replete with information, and gave us confidence in the future of our country. It will be unnecessary for me to go into the whole of the details respecting the Pacific Railway, for the hon. the Minister of Railways has made detailed explanations to the House. I will, however, briefly refer to the whole line, from the railway system of Ontario and Quebec to the Pacific Ocean. The first section to which I will direct attention is that between the

Canada Central Railway, the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway and westward *via* Lake Nipissing to a junction with that section of the Canadian Pacific now in part completed and part under construction between the west end of Lake Superior and Selkirk. As I remarked, I will avoid detail. Several Sessions ago, I made a statement to this House showing that with a certain number of wheat-growers, and with a certain acreage producing wheat, in Manitoba, the receipts from the transportation of wheat alone to Montreal would pay interest and sinking fund on the entire cost of the road, would meet the cost of maintenance, repairs, and operating expenses, and leave a surplus to the credit of the country. In 1873, after the hon. member for Lambton became the head of the Government, I intimated to him the desirability of the early construction of this section, both as a matter of policy, and as a necessary public work, to unite the eastern Provinces with the Great West. But no step has yet been taken in that direction, except the subsidies granted to the Canada Central, and the proposed construction of the Georgian Bay Branch. The hon. the Minister of Railways, I was glad to observe, alluded very briefly to the possible early commencement of the construction of this great link of the Canadian Pacific, connecting the populations of Ontario and Quebec with the Great North-West.

I, therefore, take this opportunity to say that, it will be sound policy on the part of this Government, at an early date, to construct this section connecting the Quebec and Ontario system of railways with the section from Fort William to Selkirk, so as to carry grain through, on an all-rail route, to the ships in the eastern seaports of our Dominion. I support this policy, not merely as a party matter, but as a matter that concerns the interests of the Dominion as a whole, and affects particularly the two large Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Sir, I trust that the hon. the Minister of Railways, during the Recess, will prepare a scheme for its early construction, and submit it for the sanction of Parliament at its next Session. A Railway can carry more cheaply than the canals.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

MR. DECOSMOS: My hon. friend to my right says: "No, no," but I find, Sir, that reports respecting canals show this to be, as I state. The Railways from Chicago to New York, and the Railways from the West to Philadelphia and Baltimore, are carrying more than what goes by the water system. The steel-rail revolution has nearly overthrown lake and water transportation. Besides that the crowded passenger trains from the east, and the great volume of westward-bound freight, enables the eastern-bound freight trains to carry grain and provisions at such low rates as to make water transportation neither as profitable, nor as desirable as formerly, and consequently prevents the canals and lakes from being as great carriers now, relatively to the total volume of eastern-bound freight in the United States as they once were in the past. At any rate we have spent since 1873 more than \$15,000,000 to enlarge our St. Lawrence Canal system, and we do not get out of it enough to pay current expenses. The tonnage of the shipping in the lakes is small, in comparison to what might be expected, as a corollary to our grand scheme of water transportation. Well, Sir, returning from this digression, I say that the line between the Thunder Bay—Red River section, and the railway system of Ontario and Quebec, ought to be built, and built quickly and early. I will take up another point: I

believe the late Government made a mistake in commencing work, in expending money, on the Lake Superior—Red River section of the Pacific Railway. It is really nothing more than part of the trans-continental line, it seems to me, to run as a competing line with the Pembina section half of the year, and also as a competing line for the same period with the main trunk line between Selkirk and Nipissing when the latter shall have been completed. If proper energy had been manifested, and wisdom displayed in the expenditure of the money on the through line between Nipissing and Selkirk, the work would have been carried through and completed by this time. Now, Sir, with respect to the Pacific Railway from Red River to the foot-hills of the Rocky Mountains, the hon. the Minister of Railways, with his energy and bold determination, has enunciated a policy for building it and opening up the country, which shows him accustomed to rule a country; he has shown how the resources of the North-West can be developed and the country filled with population. I endorse that policy, and look forward to the near future covering that land with prosperous farms and thriving cities, with a net-work of railways like a spider's web. I believe the hon. gentleman is one of those statesmen who does not propose to put on slow engineers; but is one who wishes our navvies to drive the buffalo and the deer before them on their way westerly to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. Now, Sir, we have had speeches delivered here with respect to the land policy of the Government,—the land policy propounded by the right hon. the Minister of the Interior, to settle the North-West with new provinces; settle it with a daring, peaceful, industrious population, who will clothe that naked land with cultivated fields, happy homesteads, busy villages, and ambitious cities,—the hum of their industries, along the line of the Pacific Railway, girdling the continent from ocean to ocean, and yielding Revenue more than will repay a hundred times over and over again, the cost of its construction. I will not enter into detail to show how the Government may be recouped by its land policy, for its expenditure in building the Pacific Railway. That has been well and fully

done by the House policy of Railway. lieve the good; and up the N permanent any poli Whilst th Governme during thi the growt and Kans Nebraska-ground, t was not a borders. a few lice only inha tribes of t in Kansas then west Nebraska, Oregon; n tana, Ida Washington only orga Territory scattered s of the Wal shores of Oregon, w the Colum Nisqually; land, with gathered u and the Sta three hund was then b the contin monthly fr ing about s then the w tory has be possessing national lif modern ci wealth, an rivals in with Sta work of c Western l Colorado, M Utah and British Col respects are fifty miles

done by the right hon. the Leader of the House, when he explained the financial policy of the Government respecting the Railway. But, Sir, I will say that I believe that policy to be sound and good; and that it is calculated to build up the North-West as successfully, as permanently, and as rapidly as any policy that can be propounded. Whilst the Railway Land policy of the Government was under discussion, and during this debate, allusion was made to the growth of population in Nebraska and Kansas. Sir, when I first slept in Nebraska—rolled up in my blanket on the ground, twenty-eight years ago—there was not a white settler's house within its borders. The frontier military posts, and a few licensed Indian traders, were its only inhabitants besides the wandering tribes of the plains. When I first slept in Kansas it was the same. There was then west of the Missouri, no State of Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Nevada, or Oregon; no Territory of Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Arizona, or Washington; no British Columbia. The only organised Governments were the Territory of Utah, composed of a few scattered settlements along the foot-hills of the Wahsatch Mountains and near the shores of Salt Lake; the Territory of Oregon, which had a few settlements on the Columbia, Willamette, Cowlitz and Nisqually; the Colony of Vancouver Island, with a mere handful of whites, gathered under the guns of Fort Victoria; and the State of California, with two to three hundred thousand people. There was then but one small mail that crossed the continent, and that was carried monthly from Salt Lake, each way, during about six months in the year. Since then the whole extent of that vast territory has been covered with young nations, possessing all the elements of vigorous national life, enjoying all the appliances of modern civilisation, yielding fabulous wealth, and stoutly contending as rivals in the race of progress with States and Provinces, the work of centuries on this continent. Western Nebraska and Kansas, with Colorado, Montana, Idaho, Washington, Utah and Nevada, are no better than British Columbia, and in many important respects are far worse. Two hundred and fifty miles west of Missouri River,

Nebraska and Kansas cease to be agricultural states. Thence for sixteen hundred miles west, till the valley of the Sacramento is reached, no cultivated land exists,—except patches in Utah nourished by irrigation. North and south, east and west, it is mountains with untold mineral wealth, and vast plains that will ever remain pasture lands, amid irredeemable deserts. The consequence is that when the western limit of cultivable lands in Nebraska, Kansas, and contiguous territories, shall have been occupied, the tide of population flowing westwardly in the United States in search of arable land, will turn northwardly and spread itself over the fertile belt in our Great North West. Of this, there seems to me to be no doubt. Hence the policy of Government in pushing onward vigorously the Pacific Railway—providing rapid facilities of transportation for our own immigration and the coming tide from the south—commends itself to every patriot. The hon. gentlemen opposite, ever since the Debates this Session began, and ever since the admission of British Columbia, have declaimed against the building of a railway at such a vast cost. Why, Sir, the total amount for the whole line, some \$80,000,000, would be voted by this Parliament at once, for the purpose of defence, if a war broke out to-morrow, and would be voted without a dissenting voice. Sir, if the expenditure for the Railway, is spread over eight or ten years, it is small in comparison to such an expenditure for defence purposes; for war expenditure would be an expenditure from which we should see no great reproductive works in the future, but would be spent at once and lost for ever. But this Railway is a great work, a great national work, that will be valuable for all time; and would become more and more valuable year after year. War would ensure a vote of a vast expenditure of millions, entailing the slaughter of our sons, the destruction of our property, and manifold miseries; whereas here, we hesitate and object to a vote for a peaceful purpose; for a railway that will always be an instrument of peace, and an implement of war. Let me draw the attention of the House to some statements made by the *Toronto Globe*, while the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) was the leader

of the late Government, on the 31st of August, 1876. It was made at the time that Lord Dufferin was in British Columbia on a mission that proved to be a failure; was made after, the route for the Pacific Railway had been adopted

from Tête Jaune Pass to Fort George; and was published, no doubt, semi-officially by the hon. member for Lambton to influence the people of British Columbia. It is as follows:

Thunder Bay to Red River,	413 miles,	average per mile	\$28,000		\$11,430,000
Red River to Livingstone,	271 do	do	18,300		4,420,000
Livingstone to Edmonton,	516 do	do	19,000		9,772,000
Edmonton to Yellow Head Pass,	283 do	do	19,000		6,601,000
Yellow Head Pass to Stewart River,	260 do	do	20,000		5,335,000
Stewart River to Bute Inlet,	288 do	do	46,500		13,420,000
Total miles	2,031				Total cost \$50,978,500
French River to Thunder Bay,	620 do	do	40,000		24,800,000
Total through line	2,651 miles.				Total cost \$75,778,500

Branches.

Georgian Bay Branch, 80 miles		\$1,120,000
Pembina Branch, 89 miles, at \$15,000 per mile		1,335,000
Subsidy to Canada Central, 120 miles, at \$12,000 per mile		1,440,000
		3,895,000
Total cost Pacific Railway		\$79,673,500

The hon. the Minister of Railways, I believe, estimated the cost of the Pacific Railway from Thunder Bay to Burrard Inlet at \$64,000,000. This is higher than the *Globe's* semi-official statement in 1876, for the longer and alleged more costly line from Thunder Bay to Bute Inlet, namely, \$50,978,500. Sir, if this estimate of the hon. member for Lambton and his Engineers were true in 1876, it is true now, and shows that what the hon. members opposite sometimes allege to be a work of appalling magnitude is no such thing, and that the objections that they urge are consequently unreasonable. No reasonable public man will truthfully say that \$50,978,500 to construct the Pacific Railway in ten years to come from Thunder Bay to the Pacific is a sum of such appalling magnitude that the people of Canada cannot bear the burden. But, Sir, no matter which is right, the estimate of the hon. the Minister of Railways or that of the hon. member for Lambton, we should not halt; but should complete the Railway to the Pacific within the next ten years. The line from Thunder Bay to French River was estimated by the *Globe* to cost \$24,800,000; the Pembina Branch, the Georgian Bay Branch, and the subsidy to the Canada Central at \$3,895,000, making the total cost of the Pacific Railway from French River to Bute Inlet, \$79,673,500. This differs little from the estimate of the hon.

the Minister of Railways, which I understood him to fix at \$82,000,000, for the entire Railway when completed and in operation. Now, Sir, the highest estimate of the cost of the Pacific Railway completed is nearly \$6,000,000 less than the total sum given by the Dominion, the Provinces and the Municipalities, in aid of Railways throughout Canada up to 1879. The Railway statistics supplied to Parliament up to April, 1879, are as follows:

	Amount of aid for Railway.
Dominion	\$65,939,900 51
Ontario	2,229,639 02
Quebec	8,513,613 27
New Brunswick	2,730,000 00
Nova Scotia	818,750 00
Municipalities	7,224,578 63
Total	\$87,456,481 43

This sum has been spent within the last fifteen or twenty years. Yet the country is none the poorer; in fact, it is far richer. The people are as well clothed, fed and housed as they were before its expenditure; and are better able to-day to expend \$80,000,000 in the construction of the Pacific Railway than they were at any period during the expenditure of the \$87,456,481. The aid for railways was paid in bonds, loans, taxes; but the Dominion will repay herself the total expenditure for the Pacific Railway out of revenue received from the sales of land

along the
hon. m
\$80,000
way; a
shadow
be suffi
view of
of the
to the
West D
that the
British
aimo se
look up
Govern
with the
Terms o
Carnarv
otherop
Before I
of the h
wish to
in regard

STATEMEN
other

Provin

Ontario.
Quebec.
Nova Sco
N. Bruns
Manitoba
Brit. Col
P. E. Isl

From th
British
two yea
to Nev
among
exporte
bec, an
they ex
wick, I
Columb
ported
cess
much
Nova
The per
bia we
Prince

George ;
semi-offi-
Lambton
Colum-

11,430,000
4,420,000
9,772,000
6,601,000
5,335,000
13,420,000

50,978,500
24,800,000

75,778,500

3,895,000

79,673,500

I under-
0, for the
ed and in
ghest esti-
Railway
less than
Dominion,
palities, in
Canada up to
supplied
879, are as

of aid for
way for
9,900 51
0,639 02
3,613 27
0,000 00
3,750 00
4,578 63

3,481 43

in the last
the country
, it is far
ell clothed,
efore its ex-
le to-day to
onstruction
they were at
ture of the
ilways was
; but the
he total ex-
ilway out of
ales of land

along the line. The proposition of the hon. member for Lambton was that \$80,000,000 would build the Pacific Railway; and I do not think that there is a shadow of doubt but that that sum will be sufficient. Sir, this completes my review of the Railway to the foot-hills east of the Rocky Mountains, and brings me to the motion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), who wishes that the road should not be constructed in British Columbia. The Esquimalt-Nanaimo section of the Pacific Railway, we look upon as a road to be built by the Government of Canada, in accordance with the contracts with Columbia, in the Terms of Union, and in fulfilment of the Carnarvon Award; but I will select some other opportunity to deal with that question. Before I deal at length with the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, I wish to draw attention to some figures in regard to British Columbia. The hon.

gentleman said, in his speech, that we had only 12,000 of a population in that Province. Some years ago the hon. gentleman said, at Walkerton, the population was 2,000. I am glad that he has given us credit of an increase of 10,000; but, nevertheless, I will endeavour to show that he is as mistaken as a statistician as he is as a statesman. I will first draw attention to some figures in regard to the imports and exports of British Columbia, as compared with the other Provinces. I will not go into all my figures at this late hour, and weary the House, but I expect the *Hansard* report to take them in full, as they are tabulated in order that this House, and this country, may know the true relation that British Columbia bears to the rest of the Dominion. I will confine myself only to such explanations as will make my statistics more intelligible. The first table is as follows:—

STATEMENT of the Imports and Exports of the Provinces for 1878-79, compared with each other on the basis of Population.

Provinces.	1878-79. Imports.	1878-79. Exports.	1878-79. Excess of Exports over Imports.	1878-79. Excess of Exports over Imports.	Estimated Population.	Per Capita Imports.	Per Capita Exports.	Per Capita Excess of Imports over Exports.	Per Capita Excess of Exports over Imports.
	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Ontario.....	34,105,826	21,706,806	12,399,020	Nil.	2,000,000	17 05	10 85	6 14	Nil.
Quebec.....	30,924,824	23,880,492	2,044,332	Nil.	1,500,000	20 61	19 25	1 36	Nil.
Nova Scotia...	7,062,614	7,326,018	Nil.	263,404	400,000	17 65	18 01	Nil.	0 66
N. Brunswick...	5,298,454	5,371,471	Nil.	75,017	300,000	17 65	17 90	Nil.	0 25
Manitoba.....	1,140,871	512,873	627,998	Nil.	50,000	22 80	10 25	12 56	Nil.
Brit. Columbia	2,440,789	2,755,972	Nil.	315,183	50,000	48 81	55 12	Nil.	6 30
P. E. Island...	835,569	1,831,389	Nil.	995,820	100,000	8 35	18 31	Nil.	9 95

From this table, it will be observed that British Columbia, although only twenty-two years old as a Province, stands next to New Brunswick, and fifth in rank among the Provinces as an importer and exporter of merchandise. Ontario, Quebec, and Manitoba imported more than they exported; Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia exported more than they imported; and British Columbia's excess over imports was nearly as much as the aggregate excess of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The *per capita* imports of British Columbia were six times more *per capita* than Prince Edward Island, nearly three times

more *per capita* than either Ontario, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick; and more than double the *per capita* imports of Quebec and Manitoba. Her exports *per capita* were five times more than the *per capita* exports of either Ontario or Manitoba, and three times more than either Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island. These are incontrovertible facts that I submit to this House, and press upon the attention of the hon. gentleman who has moved a repudiation resolution. I will now draw your attention, Sir, to a summary statement showing the exports of each Province under their respective heads. It is as follows:

STATEMENT showing Exports of the different Provinces under their respective heads.—1878-9.

Provinces.	Mine.	Fishery.	Forest.	Animals and their Produce.	Agricultural Products.	Manufactures.	Miscellaneous.
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Ontario.....	825,769	95,531	3,253,724	5,726,453	10,410,174	885,740	229,219
Quebec.....	236,448	797,662	5,274,894	7,043,290	7,253,052	333,242	93,949
Nova Scotia...	335,985	4,498,995	796,703	332,272	509,225	473,753	879
New Brunswick	153,449	681,124	3,622,514	121,163	185,071	129,062	12,952
Manitoba.....	399	2,635	Nil.	474,071	33,752	892	Nil.
P. E. Island...	45	219,431	40,258	74,545	1,234,685	256,592	Nil.
Brit. Columbia	1,530,312	643,493	273,366	268,671	2,505	Nil.	Nil.
Total.....	3,082,900	6,928,871	13,261,459	14,100,604	19,628,464	3,700,281	386,291

This statement shows that British Columbia exported one-half of the total exports of the produce of the mines of the Dominion; and in that class of exports takes the first rank. She stands fourth in rank as an exporter of the produce of the Fisheries, and exports three times more than Prince Edward Island that is so urgently asking for a share of the Fishery Award. As an exporter of the produce of the forest, she stands fifth in rank; and fifth also in rank as an exporter of animals and their produce. In agricultural products she is the smallest exporter of any of the Provinces; but I predict that after the Pacific Railway

all have been completed, she will export more than any other Province. Besides her exports, the value of her agricultural products, farming and stock-raising cannot be less than \$1,000,000, and her productive industries of other kinds, \$750,000, making the total value of products for domestic use, \$1,750,000 in 1878-9, or the total aggregate value, in that year, of exports and productions for domestic use, \$4,500,000. Need it be wondered at, then, in British Columbia, with half her population Indians, has confidence in her own magnificent resources, and content, if need be, to stand alone, that she is proud of her position and power, and that she treats with disdain those who would violate their pledges, and trample under foot the most solemn obligations? I will now, Sir, bring under the notice of the House a statement of the trade between British Columbia and the other Provinces. It is as follows:—

STATEMENT of Inter-Provincial Trade, between British Columbia and the Eastern Provinces,

since 1871. Goods imported into British Columbia from Eastern Provinces, since 1871.

July, 1871, to June 30, 1872.....	\$ 22,214 52
" 1872, " " 1873.....	75,604 08
" 1873, " " 1874.....	68,104 17
" 1874, " " 1875.....	117,054 16
" 1875, " " 1876.....	129,735 13
" 1876, " " 1877.....	160,814 00
" 1877, to Dec. 31, 1877.....	57,162 00
Year " 1878.....	169,753 00
" " 1879.....	184,564 00

Total Imports by B. C. from other Provinces.....	\$983,005 50
Total Exports of B.C. to other Provinces in gold drafts to pay for Imports.....	\$983,005 50

In round numbers, British Columbia has purchased in eight years and a half a million dollars' worth of merchandise of Ontario and Quebec, principally the former, and paid for it in gold. The 50,000 Columbians—whites, Chinese and Indians—have, within eight years and a half paid Ontario and Quebec \$20 each for goods produced in this country. That \$1,000,000, when passed from hand to hand in trade, has added \$5,000,000 to the aggregate volume of their domestic trade, and has contributed to the support of hundreds of operatives and hundreds of families,—and yet that is but the dawning of the inter-provincial trade with the Pacific Province. When there are one or two hundred thousand of a white population on our western coasts, when the Pacific Railway, completed, shall carry cheaply across the continent, the domestic market offered to eastern manufacturers in British Columbia, will be worth its \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 or more a year. Probably neither the Government nor Opposition have noted this inter-provincial trade in the past, or forecast its

volume in a growing swollen Pacific Railway; merchants Canada are not merely domestic and great earnest of nations domestic foreign Mr. Speaker to the and other Treasury. what each 1878-9.

STATEMENT in Customs and what per capita estimate Indians 25,000 consumers.

Provinces.

Ontario....
Quebec....
Nova Scotia
N. Brunswick
P. E. Island
Manitoba....
B. Columbia

Total....

This statement Customs into the was \$13, bec, No Manitoba had paid dated February as British that it was and if British that 25 5,000 worth by all consolidated enormous this statement perceive

-1878-9.

	Macel- laneous.
	\$
0	229,219
2	93,949
3	879
2	12,952
2	Nil.
2	Nil.
1	386,281

to British since 1871.	
\$ 22,214 52	
75,604 08	
66,104 17	
117,054 16	
129,735 13	
160,814 00	
57,162 00	
169,753 00	
184,564 00	

\$983,005 50

\$983,005 50

Columbia has
and a-half
chandise of
y the form-
The 50,000
and Indians
and a half
0 each for
try. That
a hand to
000,000 to
r domestic
the support
undreds of
ne dawning
with the
there are
of a white
asts, when
ted, shall
inent, the
ern manu-
a, will be
000 or more
overnment
inter-pro-
orecast its

volume in the future. It is, nevertheless, a growing domestic trade that will be swollen into grander dimensions as the Pacific Railway progresses towards completion; and after its completion, our merchants and manufacturers of Old Canada and the Maritime Provinces will not merely supply manufactures for domestic consumption on our western coast and great North-West, but will enter into earnest competition with the advanced nations of the world to supply our domestic manufactures to a thousand foreign markets around the Pacific Ocean. Mr. Speaker, I will now draw your attention to the taxes paid by British Columbia and other Provinces into the Federal Treasury. I will first give a statement of what each Province paid in Customs in 1878-9. It is as follows:—

STATEMENT showing what each Province paid in Customs into Consolidated Fund in 1878-9, and what they would have paid at the rate *per capita* paid by British Columbia, on an estimated population of 50,000, including Indians; and also on 25,000, by reckoning 25,000 Indians equal to 5,000 white consumers.

Provinces.	1879. Customs Paid.	Estimated population.	Would have paid at B. Columbia's per capita, \$10.42 on 50,000 popu- lation.	Would have paid, calcu- lating Brit- ish Columbia population at 25,000, at \$20.84 per capita.
	\$			\$
Ontario....	4,978,514	2,000,000	20,840,000	41,680,000
Quebec....	4,788,919	1,500,000	15,630,000	31,260,000
Nova Scotia	1,204,289	400,000	4,168,000	8,336,000
N. Bruns'k.	1,063,447	300,000	3,120,000	6,252,000
P. E. Island	208,438	100,000	1,042,000	2,084,000
Manitoba....	275,484	50,000	521,000	1,042,000
B. Columbia	521,443	50,000	521,443	521,443
Total....	13,040,581	4,400,000	45,848,433	91,175,443

This statement shows that the entire Customs paid by all the Provinces into the Consolidated Fund in 1878-9, was \$13,040,331. That if Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, and Prince Edward Island, had paid in Customs into the Consolidated Fund, at the same rate *per capita* as British Columbia, the total amount that it would have reached, is \$45,848,433; and if at the same rate *per capita* as British Columbia really paid, assuming that 25,000 Indians are only equal to 5,000 white consumers, the amount paid by all of the Provinces into the Consolidated Fund would have reached the enormous sum of \$91,175,443. From this statement hon. gentlemen, Sir, will perceive the astounding disproportion

between the Customs taxes paid by British Columbia, and what was paid by the other Provinces. If they had paid in Customs dues at \$10.42, the British Columbia *per capita* rate on a population of 50,000, they would have paid more than three times the amount they did; and if on the reduced basis of population for British Columbia, they would have paid six times the amount in Customs that they did. But, Sir, I will not weary the House with further explanations under this head, but I will draw your attention to another statement comparing the percentage of Customs collected in British Columbia with that of other Provinces, and the proportion that the population of that Province bears to the other Provinces. I will read it. It is as follows:

STATEMENT of Customs collected in British Columbia during the fiscal year, 1878-9, compared with the Customs collected in the same period in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba; showing, also, the proportion of population in those Provinces to that of British Columbia:—

ONTARIO.

"Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 10½ per cent. of the sum paid by Ontario—that is, 50,000 Columbians paid \$521,443, and 2,000,000 Ontarians paid \$4,978,514, the proportion of population being 1 to 40, or 5 Columbians to 200 Ontarians.

QUEBEC.

"Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 10 7-8 per cent. of the sum paid by Quebec—that is, 50,000 Columbians paid \$521,443, and 1,500,000 Quebecers paid \$4,788,919, the proportion of population being 1 to 30, or 5 Columbians to 150 Quebecers.

NOVA SCOTIA.

"Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 43 3-10 per cent. on the sum paid by Nova Scotia—that is, 50,000 Columbians paid \$521,443, and 400,000 Nova Scotians paid \$1,204,289, the proportion of population being 1 to 8, or 5 Columbians to 40 Nova Scotians.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

"Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 49 3-100 per cent. of the sum paid by New Brunswick—that is, 50,000 Columbians paid \$521,443, and 300,000 New Brunswickers paid \$1,063,447, the proportion of population being 1 to 6, or 5 Columbians to 30 New Brunswickers.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

"Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 150½ per cent. more than the sum paid by Prince Edward Island—that is, 50,000 Columbians paid \$521,443, and 100,000 Prince Edward Islanders paid \$208,438, or Columbia paid \$250½

to \$100 paid by Prince Edward Island; or \$313,005 more than Prince Edward Island, the proportion of population being 1 to 2, or 5 Columbians to 10 Prince Edward Islanders.

MANITOBA.

"Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 87 8-11 per cent. more than Manitoba—that is, (assuming the population to be equal,) Columbia paid \$187 8-11 to \$100 by Manitoba, or \$521,443 to \$275,484 by Manitoba, an excess over Manitoba of \$245,959."

This statement is so full and clear, Sir, that it is unnecessary for me to enter now upon an explanation. I will, therefore, come now to the Inland Revenue paid by the different Provinces, and I submit the following statement.

INLAND REVENUE.—Excise, Sources of Revenue: Spirits, Malt Liquor, Malt, Tobacco, Petroleum Inspection, Manufactures, Seizures and other Receipts, 1878-9.

Province.	Estimated Population.	Total Excise.	Per Capita	More than Columbia	Less than Columbia
		\$	\$	\$	\$
Ontario.....	2,000,000	3,383,315	1 19	0 55	NIL.
Quebec.....	1,500,000	1,472,350	0 98	0 34	NIL.
Nova Scotia...	400,000	232,011	0 55	NIL.	0 09
N. Brunswick.	300,000	234,360	0 74	0 10	NIL.
P. E. Island....	100,000	50,371	0 50	NIL.	0 14
Manitoba.....	50,000	54,223	1 08	0 44	NIL.
B. Columbia....	50,000	32,319	0 64	NIL.	NIL.

In this statement the estimated population of each Province is given, the amount paid by each Province, the rate *per capita* in excise in each, and the amount *per capita* more or less than in British Columbia. It shows that the Excise paid in Ontario is 55 cents more *per capita* than in British Columbia; 34 cents more in Quebec, 10 cents more in New Brunswick and 44c. more in Manitoba; and that it is 9c. less in Nova Scotia, and 14c. less in Prince Edward Island. This shows that British Columbia pays more *per capita* in Excise than either Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island and less than the other Provinces. What she is, however, deficient in her contribution to Excise, in comparison with some Provinces is a hundred times counterbalanced by her payments in Customs in excess of all others. Before leaving this question, however, I may remark that we had, a few days ago, a discussion on the Tariff. The whole energy of the Opposition and whole strength of the Government was directed to one point—the Customs Revenue and how it was levied. No one,

so far as I recollect, touched upon Excise and Stamps, amounting to over \$5,500,000, nor upon Post-office and Public Works, and other receipts amounting in all to over \$4,000,000. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) did discuss the sale of Crown Lands; but not with respect to Revenue. His arguments were directed solely to the best mode of managing our North-West lands, with a view to settlement. Out of \$22,517,381, the total Consolidated Revenue for 1878-9, the Customs only yielded \$12,900,659. The difference, \$10,000,000, in round numbers, remained unquestioned, showing the opinion of the Opposition to be, if it showed anything at all, that the sources of Revenue, other than Customs, as managed by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, to be in a state of perfection. Even the long and wearisome discussion on the Tariff by hon. gentlemen opposite, amounted to little or nothing; for, if they were in office to-morrow, they could not reduce taxation, because the obligations of the country are such that taxation cannot be lowered: and hence some other expedient must be adopted to lighten the burdens of the people, if too oppressive. We will consider now the Consolidated Revenue, and Expenditure with respect to British Columbia, inasmuch as our Province has been supposed by hon. gentlemen opposite to be a poor contributor; also to show the payments required of each Province, and to show what British Columbia is entitled to pay at the ordinary *per capita* of the Dominion, as her share to the Consolidated Fund, and her share for Public Expenditure. I have in my hand a summary detail, from the Public Accounts, of the Consolidated Fund and Expenditure for 1878-9, which I will give to the *Hansard* reporter for insertion, and not enter upon the full details now. The summary is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Taxes, 1878-9.

Customs	\$12,900,659
Excise	5,390,763
Bill Stamps.....	185,199
Total.....	\$18,476,613

Other Receipts.

Post Office.....	1,172,418
Public Works, including Railways	1,863,149

Interests of
ment)....
Interests of
ary)....
Ordnance
Casual...
Premium
Bank Imp
Fines, For
Tonnage D
do
Steamboat
Fisheries...
Cullers...
Militia...
Penitenti
Miscellane
Superannu
Dominion
Gas Inspe
Insurance
Weights a

Tot
CONSOLIDA
\$22,517,381
Expend
capita

Ontario..
Quebec..
Nova Sco
New Bru
Prince Ed
Manitoba
British Co

Sir, no
this Ho
just cha
laid on
I have
showst
is \$5.1
Expend
Domini
taxatio
equally
howeve
Reven
vince i
the of
unequa
that it
mater
people
and so

Interests on Investments (permanent).....	521,494
Interests on Investments (temporary).....	71,005
Ordinance Lands.....	40,849
Casual.....	47,621
Premium and Discount.....	460
Bank Imposts.....	2,853
Fines, Forfeitures and Seizures.....	32,148
Tonnage Dues (River Police).....	21,361
do (Mariners' Fund).....	37,757
Steamboat Inspection.....	12,331
Fisheries.....	17,738
Cullers.....	24,715
Militia.....	16,031
Penitentiaries.....	53,115
Miscellaneous Receipts.....	15,325
Superannuation.....	41,959
Dominion Lands (Manitoba).....	23,828
Dominion Steamers.....	1,612
Gas Inspection and Law Stamps.....	3,172
Insurance Inspection.....	6,134
Weights and Measures.....	13,685
Total.....	\$4,040,768

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF DOMINION.—Total Consolidated Revenue, 1878-9, \$22,517,392; Total Population, 4,400,000; Average Revenue, *per capita*, \$5.12. Total Expenditure, 1878-9, \$24,455,381 56; Total Population, 4,400,000; Average Expenditure, *per capita*, \$5.56.

Province.	Estimated Population.	Approximate Average Revenue per Capita.	Share of Consolidated Revenue required of each Province as per population.	Approximate Average Expenditure per Capita.	Proportionate share of Expenditure required of each Province, as based on Population.
		\$	\$	\$	\$
Ontario.....	2,000,000	5.12	10,240,000	5.56	11,120,000
Quebec.....	1,500,000	5.12	7,680,000	5.56	8,340,000
Nova Scotia.....	400,000	5.12	2,048,000	5.56	2,224,000
New Brunswick.....	300,000	5.12	1,536,000	5.56	1,668,000
Prince Edward Island..	100,000	5.12	512,000	5.56	556,000
Manitoba.....	50,000	5.12	256,000	5.56	278,000
British Columbia.....	50,000	5.12	256,000	5.56	278,000
	4,400,000		22,528,000		24,464,000

Sir, no statements can be submitted to this House that show more correctly the just charges for Revenue and Expenditure laid on each Province than the one that I have just read to this House. It shows that the rate *per capita* for Revenue is \$5.12, and that the rate *per capita* for Expenditure is \$5.56, throughout the whole Dominion from sea to sea. The burden of taxation and expenditure thus rests equally upon the entire people. When, however, the *per capita* contribution to the Revenue and Expenditure of any Province is higher than in any one or all the other Provinces, that Province is unequally and unfairly taxed. I admit that it is impossible to impose taxes with mathematical exactness upon our whole people. Some sections of our country and some classes of our people, under our

Summary.

Taxes.....	\$18,476,613
Other Receipts.....	4,040,768

Total Consolidated Fund... \$22,517,381

SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE.

Charges for Debt and Subsidies....	\$11,942,641
Ordinary Expenditure.....	6,941,577
Charges on Revenue.....	5,561,162

Total Expenditure..... \$24,455,386

Now, Sir, I have framed a tabular statement that shows in the most concise form possible what each Province in 1878-9 ought to have contributed to the Consolidated Fund, and what ought to have been their respective contributions to the Public Expenditure. I will read it. It is as follows:—

system of taxation, will contribute more to the Revenue than other sections and other classes, and our only course is so to impose taxes as to rest approximately evenly on all. British Columbia, however, is one of those sections of the Dominion that contributes far more *per capita* than any other Province: She contributed in 1878-9, an excess, over her just share to the Consolidated Fund, of \$297,762; and an excess, over her legitimate contribution to the Expenditure, of \$275,762. The former and following statements prove this clearly and indisputably to this House:

REVENUE.—CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Total sum required of British Columbia, to pay her share of Consolidated Fund, on basis of population, 1878-9.....	\$256,000
--	-----------

Total sum actually paid by British Columbia, into Consolidated Fund, in Customs and Excise, 1878-9.....	553,762
Total sum actually paid into Consolidated Fund by British Columbia, in excess of sum required as her share on basis of population, 1878-9	297,762

EXPENDITURE.—CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Total sum required of British Columbia, to meet her share of expenditure, on basis of population, 1878-9. \$278,000	
Total sum actually paid by British Columbia, in Customs and Excise, toward Dominion Expenditure.....	553,762
Total sum actually paid by British Columbia, in Customs and Excise, toward Dominion Expenditure, in excess of amount required, on basis of population, 1878-9.....	275,762

For a people numerically so small in comparison with the populations of older and larger Provinces, the contribution of British Columbia, in excess of her just proportion, is enormous. The excess is larger than the whole contribution to the Customs Revenue by Manitoba, or the entire Customs and Excise contribution of Prince Edward Island. Yet, Sir, not a murmur has been heard from our people. We have borne the enormous burden of Federal taxation as a manly, self-reliant people. We have only asked the Dominion to meet her just obligations to the Province; and yet up to the present, the greatest of the Dominion's obligations has not been met; and an hon. gentleman opposite proposes to repudiate that. The hon. member for West Durham spoke to-day as if his own Province, Ontario, paid nearly everything. He said she was willing to spend her money throughout the Dominion. The

House ought to understand that we have ceased to be provincial, and that we meet here as representatives of the Dominion; that we pay taxes as the citizens of Canada; and no matter what the revenue may be—no matter what the expenditure—whether outside, for our agency in England, or for purposes inside, the expenditure is so much for British Columbia, Nova Scotia, and other Provinces as well as for Ontario. The hon. gentleman keeps his books in single, double and treble entry—he keeps his books for the Dominion, the Provinces, the counties, the townships, and so on, *ad infinitum*, and took occasion to read from them to-day to show how much the other Provinces received from Ontario. Nothing could be more subversive of good feeling under our Federal form of Government than parading what each Province contributes to the Federal Exchequer merely in laudation of Ontario, and thus raising invidious distinctions between the Provinces of this Dominion. None but a parish statesman could do such a thing. The statement often made in the press, that Ontario pays all the Revenue, is not correct. True, she has a large population, but the citizens of Quebec might as well say they pay all, because their number is also very large. Later on I will deal with this issue. I wish now, Sir, to submit to the House a tabular statement showing the total approximate amount of Revenue paid by British Columbia in eight years into the Federal Treasury. I will read certain portions, and hand the table to the *Hansard* reporter for insertion. It is as follows:

TOTAL APPROXIMATE
1879, into

Customs.....
Excise.....
Total taxes.....

Post-office.....
Ocean service.....
Telegraph.....
Harbour dues.....
Miscellaneous.....
Share Interest.....
Premiums.....
Marine Fund.....
Steamboat Inspection.....
Fines, etc.....
Casual.....
Militia.....
Superannuation.....

This statement shows that in 1871, to British Columbia Customs of \$3,392,351,314 Revenue, contributed 30th June must appear singular, member of our sm whites, could have \$4,000,000. The people croaking (Mr. C. West D. who can generous and to and pushed higher to them seat in branch summa by Br. property

TOTAL APPROXIMATE AMOUNT paid by British Columbia, between July 20, 1871, and June 30, 1879, into Consolidated Fund.

	1871-2.	1872-3.	1873-4.	1874-5.	1875-6.	1876-7.	1877-8.	1878-9.	Total for Eight Years.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	
Customs.....	354,861 00	303,885 29	335,787 29	414,331 85	487,013 34	404,595 42	425,391 34	514,854 91	
Excise.....	1,457 14	5,723 93	10,074 84	11,181 01	14,918 71	20,204 60	24,935 33	31,969 20	
Total taxes....	356,321 74	309,619 22	356,462 13	425,512 86	501,947 05	425,169 02	470,326 67	546,824 11	\$3,392,152-80

CASUAL AND TERRITORIAL REVENUE.

Post-office....	777 34	16,740 90	9,504 20	11	14,074 67	13,431 03	16,644 61	16,791 33	
Ocean service.....		24,732 72	19,440 29	12	12,439 84	3,152 21	1,952 23	1,012 09	
Telegraph.....		14,310 45	10,120 72	9 18	9,257 98	7,525 02	8,530 57	5,170 70	
Harbour dues.....		12,513 23	295 40						
Miscellaneous.....		1,113 42	3,945 97	2,157 29				39 85	
Share Interest.....									
Premiums.....	7,190 04	6,310 00	8,415 00	11,674 00	13,631 82	12,831 15	11,038 82	11,263 90	
Marine Fund.....					2,349 95	1,578 09	2,612 25	2,565 68	
Steamboat In- spection.....					405 87	449 83	342 34	620 04	
Fines, etc.....						301 70	3,271 72	758 94	
Casual.....						2,440 60	735 00	611 68	
Militia.....						476 06	332 73	876 64	
Superannua- tion.....					630 00	670 00	686 00	638 00	
	7,976 34	75,720 81	44,730 49	38,559 70	53,255 99	43,806 74	40,198 27	41,107 83	= 351,344 17
Total...									\$3,743,896 97

This statement shows that from July 20, 1871, to 30th June, 1879, British Columbia paid to the Dominion, in Customs and Excise, the large sum of \$3,392,152.80. In addition she paid \$351,314 in Casual and Territorial Revenue, making a gross total of her contributions, from 20th July, 1871, to 30th June, 1879, of \$3,743,696.97. It must appear to hon. gentlemen somewhat singular, if the statements of the hon. member for West Durham be true, that if our small population is only 12,000 whites,—it must appear singular how they could have paid in those years, nearly \$4,000,000 into the Dominion Treasury. The people who contribute thus, without croaking like the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake)—the people who can show themselves willing and generous enough to bear such a burden, and to put their shoulder to the wheel and push on the state car, should receive a higher appreciation than has been extended to them since I have had the honour of a seat in this House. Before leaving this branch of my subject, Sir, I will give a summary showing the total amount paid by British Columbia in excess of her proportionate share. It is as follows:

British Columbia during eight years, from July 20, 1871 to June 30, 1879, paid in Customs and Excise into Consolidated Fund..... \$3,392,152 80

British Columbia contributed to Consolidated Fund from Casual and Territorial Revenues, from July 20, 1871 to June 30, 1879 (under estimated)..... 351,344 17
\$3,743,496 97

Proportionate share of Consolidated Fund required of British Columbia in eight years, July 20, 1871 to June 30, 1879, at \$256,000 per annum, taking the financial year 1878-9 as the basis for the whole period.... 2,048,000 00

Total amount contributed by British Columbia from all sources to Consolidated Fund in excess of her proportionate contribution, based on Returns of Revenue for 1878-9, in eight years, ending June 30, 1879.. \$1,695,496 97

Let me repeat that the revenue we have paid in excess of our legitimate share, assuming that each citizen should pay at the same rate, approximately, throughout the Dominion, nearly \$1,750,000, and, at the same time, we have not received that return we ought to have received from the Dominion.

on. There under the ment, and can oppose tribution, sion of the ty for, and Now, Sir, hewing the d have paid at the per r Provinces, d have paid of the Do- nt British each of the on at their rates. I

ns Duties in the amount on; also the the Dominion

ms, Customs, average, per capita, Dominion, 83.50.	
0.00	\$
500	175,000

043	346,443
143	521,443

ing a huge gs began to he lantern, upon the ucing them y hope the co-night, to of British of stopping ave heard time, upto riends op- member for about rail-

way expenditure in British Columbia, surveys, and all that sort of thing. I have endeavoured to find out the total amount of expenditure in that Province for Pacific Railway surveys, and will give it shortly, Sir, though there have been three Governments in existence since the arrangement was entered into, to commence construction of the Pacific Railway in that Province, yet not a pick has been struck in the ground in the way of construction, not a shovel full of earth has been lifted; not a cart full of earth or stone has been carried; not a culvert has been built, not a bridge erected, not a tie laid, not a rail stretched,—nothing has been done whatever; yet we have been told here that a large sum of money has been expended in surveys. Now, before I name that sum, I will call the attention of the House back to the time before British Columbia entered the Dominion. We find such men as Sir George Cartier saying that all the money expended for surveys should be charged to the company who was to undertake the construction of the road. When the Allan Charter was granted, all expenses for surveys were to be borne by the parties holding the charter. Hence the charging of surveys to British Columbia is wrong in principle, and contrary to the utterances of Government in Parliament. I will show this House, nevertheless, on the basis I have just presented, that British Columbia has paid dollar for dollar, and more, into the Dominion Treasury for every dollar expended in connection with the Railway surveys in that Province. I will show you also what we paid in excess. I draw attention to the following statement, namely:

STATEMENT showing surplus paid by British Columbia over her *pro rata* contribution into Consolidated Fund, compared with Railway Expenditure in and for British Columbia up to June 30, 1879.

Surplus of British Columbia over <i>pro rata</i> contribution (see former statement)	\$1,695,496 97
Total Railway Expenditure in and for British Columbia, directly to June 30, 1879	1,499,956 19
Balance in favour of Railway Expenditure, held by Dominion Government	195,540 78

A large proportion of this money for Railway surveys was squandered, first, through incompetency, and in the next place this money was not all expended in

British Columbia. In making this statement I do not expect you to believe that I acknowledge the right of British Columbia to pay anything more than her *pro rata* share to the Consolidated Fund. I want, however, to show you that after deducting this vast sum for Railway surveys, \$1,499,956.17, from the surplus in our Treasury, there is \$195,540 to the credit of British Columbia, showing that the railway surveys in Columbia actually cost Canada, as a whole, nothing. Yet, we have the hon. member for West Durham, and all the brilliant lights around him, condemning the construction of the Railway in British Columbia, and attempting to repudiate the solemn obligation entered into between Canada and British Columbia, and Lord Carnarvon. We had yesterday and to-day, a long and elaborate speech from the hon. member from West Durham, and in it the hon. gentleman made a statement that the total population of British Columbia was 12,000. I presume it has not been denied by anybody, and I am sure, for the purpose of reviewing his statement, I will not. I find in my notes that I have headed a table, founded on this statement: "Blake, the Statistician," of which the following is the substance: If only 12,000 people paid \$521,443 into the Customs, the *per capita* rate would be \$44.43; 12,000 paid \$32,319 in Excise, the *per capita* would be \$2.70; total sum paid in Excise and Customs, \$553,762; hence total *per capita* of the population at that rate, \$47.13. Now, if Ontario with an estimated population of 2,000,000, paid an equal *per capita* sum in Customs and Excise into the Dominion Treasury, as British Columbia on the Blake basis, she would have paid \$94,260,000! I think if we had all that money in our Treasury, the genial face of the hon. the Minister of Finance would be lit up with unusual pleasure, and he would then have no difficulty in pushing on to completion all the great public works this country has ever dreamed of. Now, Sir, we will consider the cost of the Yale-Kamloops section of the Pacific Railway. I am not in possession of the statistics that were used by the hon. the Minister of Railways yesterday, and subsequently by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, but, knowing the country

through which this section of the Railway will pass, I estimate, that when completed, it will not cost this country over \$8,000,000. I have heard a gentleman, who is somewhat familiar with railways state it would not cost over \$7,000,000. But I have added the \$1,000,000 named as contingencies to that sum, and fix the total cost of Yale-Kamloops branch at \$8,000,000. Sir, I wish to show to this House that if this Railway is constructed it will have been with British Columbia money, and not with Dominion money, except so far as our contributions to the Consolidated Fund belong to the Dominion. I wish to show that this Dominion, outside of British Columbia, will not be called upon to contribute to the construction of the Yale-Kamloops Section of the line, and that all we ask is the credit and management of the Dominion. I believe I can demonstrate this beyond controversy. I will read my statement:

STATEMENT showing annual cost to Canada for Interest on Capital invested in completion of Yale-Kamloops section of Pacific Railway. Also, Statement showing how Canada is repouped for Interest.

TOTAL COST.

Yale-Kamloops Lake Railway 127 miles	\$8,000,000
EXPENDITURE AND INTEREST, 1880 TO 1885.	
1880-1 Expenditure, \$1,000,000, at 4 per cent., 4 years	\$160,000
1881-2 Expenditure, \$1,500,000, at 4 per cent., 3 years	180,000
1882-3 Expenditure, \$1,500,000, at 4 per cent., 2 years	120,000
1883-4 Expenditure, \$2,000,000, at 4 per cent., 1 year	80,000
1884-5 Expenditure, \$2,000,000, at 4 per cent., to allow for interest on inter-yearly payments	80,000
Total Interest, June 30, 1885	\$620,000

EXCESS OF RECEIPTS AND SAVING TO CONSOLIDATED FUND.

1. Annual amount paid by British Columbia in Customs in excess of the proportionate contributions to the Consolidated Fund required of her on the basis of the annual average *per capita* Customs Tax of the Dominion, namely, \$346,443 in five years, from 1880 to 1885. (See previous statements)
2. British Columbia Loan Act, 1863, for £250,000 sterling, expires July, 1883, so there will be 10 per cent. Sinking Fund and

Interest saved in 1883-4 and 1884-5	50,000
3. Vancouver Loan Act, 1862, for £40,000 sterling, expires in April, 1882, so there will be saved 10 per cent. for Interest and Sinking Fund for 1882-3, 1883-4 and 1884-5	60,000
	\$1,842,215
Total Interest 4 years on Expenditure of \$8,000,000	620,000
Total Excess paid by British Columbia after paying the interest on \$8,000,000, 4 years, on Yale-Kamloops Railway	\$1,222,215

I think, Sir, that I have now done what I promised. I have shown that when the Yale-Kamloops Branch shall have been completed, the total interest on the capital—\$8,000,000—invested in its construction and completion, namely, \$620,000, will be repaid by British Columbia; and that the total amount of receipts in excess of her *pro rata* contribution for Customs, to Consolidated Fund, and the Saving on Expiring Loans, will be, between 1880 and 1885, \$1,842,215, leaving a balance, in excess of the interest, in the Dominion Treasury of \$1,222,215. Now, Sir, it will be perceived that British Columbia has no desire to oppress any portion of the Dominion to construct the Pacific Railway from the Pacific to the Rocky Mountains. All she asks is for the Dominion to use her credit in raising the funds, and to exercise a wise and economical management in the construction of the Yale-Kamloops Railway. The total annual interest on its cost of construction, after completion, will be \$320,000, and, if the road were not to earn a sufficient surplus to meet the interest, the \$1,222,215 referred to will pay the whole for five years longer, when the increased contributions to the Dominion Treasury will continue to pay it and the interest on the extension easterly and westwardly. I regret that the hon. member for West Durham is not here, for I wish to refer to his remarks about the vast sums of money Ontario and Quebec contributed to this enterprise. But, Sir, no statistician, no actuary, could, by any possible means, discover the sum these two Provinces respectively paid into the Dominion Treasury, except as given in the Returns. The hon. gentleman gave us figures showing that the total charge against British

Columbia, for Receipts, w years. Bu according t subject, whic that we are any sum, no ments my ho will assur that Britis in excess of Dominion of the Dom statesman v upon that years old, v sum of \$8 years, will year at 4 population suffer an id Capital A that will generation; Columbia v thousand f were pres tions, for th him of the change. If public posit pires to co country, ins croaker, I dignified co not be to cr that any w you are n would have leader of th take a new miserable t tion. Ther of the Opp bidding for Minister o minded lea though I m occasionally just merit work and h promote th force it ahe heard so m how progr slow we ar gentleman of the Un

Columbia, from all sources in excess of Receipts, was some \$844,000 in eight years. But I have shown that, according to my way of treating that subject, which, I think, is the correct one, that we are not indebted in that sum, nor any sum, no matter how many similar statements my hon. friend may make. But I will assume, for argument sake, that British Columbia has received, in excess of what she paid into the Dominion Treasury, on the *pro rata* of the Dominion, \$840,000. Now, any statesman worthy of the name, looking upon that vast Province, only twenty years old, should have said: This total sum of \$840,000 at the end of eight years, will amount to \$33,600, a year at 4 per cent., and the present population of this Dominion will not suffer an iota; for it will be passed to Capital Account, and met by loans that will not be redeemed in this generation; and that, in a few years, Columbia will recoup the Dominion a thousand fold. I wish my hon. friend were present to hear these calculations, for they would, possibly, convince him of the error of his way in making this charge. If I were holding the important public position of my hon. friend, who aspires to control the Government of this country, instead of playing the rôle of a croaker, I would select a more dignified occupation. My policy would not be to croak against the Government that they went too fast, but I would say, you are not going fast enough. That would have been a worthy policy for a leader of the Opposition, if he wished to take a new departure and cast away the miserable traditions relating to this question. Then we would have had the leader of the Opposition vying with, and outbidding for popular favour, the energetic Minister of Railways and the large minded leader of this Government—although I may differ with both of them occasionally, I am glad to concede their just merit—to show who could “best work and best degree,” and who could best promote the interests of the country, and force it ahead. Then we would not have heard so much about the United States; how progressive their people are, and how slow we are. The argument of the hon. gentleman is simply this: that the people of the United States are a progressive

people: that we rush there, but they do not rush here. And so we have this everlasting lowering cloud cast upon the country. I will not say that the hon. member for West Durham, and the hon. gentlemen who surround him, are unpatriotic. I never use the word disloyal without attaching some meaning to it. I have generally found, with respect to those people who are always prating about their loyalty, that, if you scratch a little beneath the skin, you will find very little loyalty. Our material interests modify our sentimental opinions, and when the two come into conflict, it is the opinions which give away. I do not like mere lip-loyalty, either from the Government side or the Opposition side. I like that loyalty which upholds order, maintaining the laws of our country inviolate, and if ever we have to change our relationship with the Mother Country, we will do it in a constitutional way and not hypocritically. We have heard a great deal about the great milch-cow of Ontario. I have not yet completed my enquiries into the sum of money expended in Ontario, during 1878-79. But as far as I have gone, I believe that in 1878-79, Ontario received more from the Dominion Treasury than she paid in. The Customs, Excise and Stamps—the only taxes imposed—collected in Ontario in 1878-79 was in round numbers, \$8,460,000; and the expenditure for Salaries, Public Works, Interest, etc., \$8,560,000. Thus showing that the great milch-cow of Ontario has received dollar for dollar, and more than she contributed in taxes in that year. Of what then has she to complain? For what reason shall her public men attempt to dominate this Dominion, and insultingly tell smaller Provinces in the language of the late Government to Lord Carnarvon: “It is especially the duty of the smaller Provinces to defer somewhat to the opinions of the older and more populous Provinces from which the Revenue for building all such public works is derived?” The sooner the systematic delusion of Ontario, that she is the great milch-cow, is blown to the winds, the better. The two millions and a-half of Canadians outside her border will not submit to be treated as though they were objects of charity, and that by a Province that never had a surplus dollar in her Treasury, till after she had united with

them. I now propose, Sir, to speak about the Carnarvon Award. We have a Repudiation Resolution placed before this House, by the hon. member for West Durham. He proposes to repudiate a solemn obligation. He proposes to repudiate the Railway clause of the Terms of Union, and also the Carnarvon Award, made in 1874, and accepted with thanks by the Government led by the hon. member for Lambton. The hon. member for West Durham appears on the Parliamentary stage this Session in two very distinct parts: one, as Award-preserver; the other as Award-breaker. Hon. gentlemen, Sir, will recollect that the hon. member for Algoma moved for a Committee to enquire into all matters connected with the disputed boundary of Ontario. On that occasion the hon. member for West Durham, supported by the hon. members for Bothwell, Elgin, and Lambton, opposed the motion, denouncing it as an attempt to violate a solemn Convention, as the entering wedge to break the Ontario Boundary Award, and concluded his speech by impressing the House with the necessity of maintaining the Boundary Award intact, as it was "infinitely more important in its moral than in its material aspect," that faith should be kept with Ontario in that matter. So full of saintly fervour did the hon. gentleman appear, so exercised seemed his righteous soul over the possibility of disturbing the Ontario Boundary Award by granting a Committee of Enquiry, that he reminded me of Milton's invocation of the Muse:

"What in me is dark
Illumine; what is low, raise and support,
That to the height of this great argument
I may assert eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to men."

The House, however, decreed that the motion should be carried; and all the mental agony of the hon. member for West Durham, excited by a majority of this House who were so lost to the same high sense of pure international morality as that which swelled his patriotic bosom, seemed wasted till the echoes of his pathetic appeal were caught up by the *Globe* and spread far and wide throughout the land. The hon. gentleman, however, has now appeared in the part of Award-breaker. He seems to have forgotten the pure doctrines of international mor-

ality that he, with the assistance of his hon. friends from Bothwell and Lambton, had applied to the Ontario Boundary Award. When he applied those doctrines, no doubt the motion of the hon. member for Algoma made him feel sick: the possibility of losing 120,000 square miles of territory awarded to Ontario, that Judge Armour and Judge Ramsay, counsel employed by the late Dominion Government, testified recently that Ontario was not entitled to, was indeed a heavy prospective blow to Ontarian supremacy. That may partially account for the high moral stand taken by the hon. member for West Durham on the Ontario Boundary Award—an Award that, by his own admission, required a Statute to make it valid and binding. Now, however, when the Government proposes to keep faith with British Columbia, to abide by the Carnarvon Award, to vote \$1,000,000 for Railway construction, the hon. member for West Durham comes forward to break, to repudiate the Carnarvon Award that the late Government accepted as a settlement, and told Lord Carnarvon that it was not contrary to any Resolution of Parliament or Statutory enactment, and consequently held to be valid. He quotes no high and pure principles of international morals and applies them to the Carnarvon Award to account for his change in opinion in a few weeks with respect to International Awards, or to justify his course; but he manifests, by the production of his Resolution to postpone Railway construction, such a remarkable change in his code of inter-state morals as can only be explained by himself, and then the public may decide whether his international morality is or is not "false and hollow." The parts taken by the hon. gentleman, respecting the Ontario Boundary Award and the Carnarvon Award remind me somewhat of another great Reformer referred to in the couplet of Rabelais:

"The Devil was sick, the Devil a saint
would be;
"The Devil was well, the Devil a saint
was he."

Before I conclude this branch of my subject, Sir, I desire to draw still further the attention of this House to the opinions entertained by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and outside of it, when the Terms of Union, in 1871, were

under d
fore the
speeches
Bothwe
this Ses
dary Aw
utteranc
course
endeavor
Award a
the Term
attention
Terms of

"The
take to
taneously
Union, o
the Pacific
from such
the Rock
conne t
the Railw
secure th
ten years

The first
I find,
February

"The T
Treaty."
I will gi
Governor
speech
Columbi

"The
British A
Legislati
Etienne
there sho
a questi
magnitud
treaty be
in quest
Canada

These
guished
holding
the nat
for two
liamen
that T
for W
hon. 1
J. Sm
for W
this la

"W
asking
this ir
becom
be pilg

under discussion in Parliament and before the country; and, also, to the speeches made by the hon. members for Bothwell, West Durham and Lambton, this Session, respecting the Ontario Boundary Award, and to a comparison of their utterances on that occasion with the course they are now pursuing in endeavouring to repudiate the Carnarvon Award as well as the Railway clause or the Terms of Union. I will first direct attention to the Railway clause of the Terms of Union. It is as follows:

"The Government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement simultaneously, within two years from the date of Union, of the construction of a railway from the Pacific towards the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected east of the Rocky Mountains towards the Pacific to connect the seaboard of British Columbia with the Railway system of Canada, and further to secure the completion of such Railway within ten years from the date of Union."

The first interpretation of that document, I find, is given by Lord Lisgar, on February 1st, 1871, when he said:

"The Terms of Union are in the nature of a Treaty."

I will give you the opinion of another Governor, Hon. Mr. Letellier, who in a speech in the Senate, on the British Columbia question, said:

"The Resolutions respecting the Union of all British America were first brought up in the Legislative Council of Canada by the late Sir Etienne Taché, and I cannot understand why there should be any difficulty now in discussing a question of the same nature though of far less magnitude. Those Resolutions were a sort of treaty between the Provinces; the Resolutions in question will also be a quasi-treaty between Canada and British Columbia."

These are the opinions of two distinguished public men; and both unite in holding that the Terms of Union were in the nature of a Treaty. But it remained for two other distinguished lights of Parliament to explain the binding force of that Treaty: they were the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith). I find that the hon. member for West Durham on that occasion used this language:

"Were not hon. members justified then in asking for further information before taking this irrevocable step. If this measure should become law, the faith of the Dominion would be pledged, and without the consent of British

Columbia could never break one jot or tittle (of) these cast-iron obligations."

Now, notwithstanding the fact, that the hon. member for West Durham made this statement on the floor of this House, in 1871, that hon. gentleman produced a Resolution here to-day, asking for the postponement of the construction of the Yale-Kamloops Section of the Railway in the Province of British Columbia. He stated, in 1871, that the Terms of Union could not be broken "without the consent of British Columbia;" and yet without her consent he attempts to break them, to repudiate the Railway clause by refusing to sanction the vote asked by the Government. The next great authority on this matter is the hon. member for Westmoreland. That hon. gentleman is reported to have said, in 1871:

"The faith of the country was pledged by the Resolution to complete the Railway within ten years no matter if the result should be ruin. No verbal reservations could have effect; the written record alone could hold, and the words of the Resolution were clear, and if in two years the Railway was not commenced British Columbia could appeal to the Imperial Government."

The understanding of the hon. member for Westmoreland was then that this Treaty was a binding obligation on this Dominion; yet strange as it must now appear, the hon. member for Westmoreland was the gentleman who seconded to-day the Resolution of the hon. member for West Durham repudiating it. We have in these extracts the opinions given, nine years ago, by the hon. members for West Durham and Westmoreland as to the binding force of the Treaty of Union; and we have the unexampled spectacle, to-day—after seven years continuous violation of the Terms of Union, including five years' administration of the Government, they supported, and of which they had been members—of the self-same hon. gentlemen shamelessly moving and seconding a resolution to continue to violate that solemn and binding obligation. I wish now to draw the attention of the House to the utterances of the hon. member for Bothwell, on the question of the Ontario Boundary Award raised by my hon. friend from Algoma, this Session, and apply the principles he has expressed to the course the hon. gentleman and other members of the Opposition are now pursuing in respect to the Carnarvon

Award. He said, on page 64 of the *Hansard*, this year :

"I am opposed to the Committee for which the hon. gentleman asks in his motion. I think, Sir, that the Parliament of Canada, at all events, the Government of Canada, are in honour and in good faith bound by the Award of the Arbitrators appointed to decide this question of boundary.

Now, Sir, I maintain that, if the language used here is correct, as regards the Ontario Boundary Award, it is still more correct in regard to an obligation, in regard to the Terms of Union for which we have the sanction of an Imperial Statute, and the sanction of the Parliament of this country; and that if "the Government of Canada are in honour and good faith" bound by the Boundary Award, it is undoubtedly more closely bound by the Carnarvon Award which it had accepted. He further says, on page 66 of *Hansard* :

"For this House to grant a Committee of Enquiry, for the purpose of attacking the Award of the Arbitrators in this matter, instead of confirming it, would be acting just as our southern neighbours would have done, had they refused to abide by the Halifax Award. It would be just as flagrant a breach of good faith as if Great Britain had refused to pay the money awarded by the Geneva Arbitration. The Government of Canada is continuous. Its obligations are not ended by a change of Ministry, and Ministers are solemnly bound by any action of a previous Government.

"Would it be proper for Mr. Hayes, at Washington, to ignore the Halifax Commission as an obligation undertaken by his predecessor, Mr. Grant? Would that be a right and proper mode of proceeding? And yet that might as well be done as to repudiate the Award of these Arbitrators.

"The gentlemen composing the Board of Arbitrators had a full opportunity of considering the case, and they gave it their fullest consideration."

Allow me to tell hon. gentlemen opposite, that we have, in these utterances of the hon. member for Bothwell, a statement of principles to the effect, when applied, that we would be guilty of a breach of International Law by not carrying out the Treaty of 1871 with British Columbia, and the Carnarvon Award made and accepted by the Government of which he was a member. Notwithstanding this, we have had an ex-Minister of Justice placing before this House a Repudiation Resolution. The hon. member for Bothwell complained that the appointment of the Boundary Committee was to break the Award, when no such object was

ever expressed, so far as I know. But the vote before the House, that is intended to fulfil the conditions, of the Carnarvon Award, in some small measure, he and his hon. friends opposite unitedly propose to reject. They want the Ontario Boundary Award to be recognised, whilst they repudiate the Carnarvon Award. The hon. gentleman says it would have been "a flagrant breach of faith" if Great Britain had not paid the Geneva Award. Then why is it not "a flagrant breach of faith" not to pay the Carnarvon Award? The principle is the same. He says: "The Ministers are solemnly bound by any action of a previous Government." Then why did the Government of which he was a member not carry out the Railway clause of the Terms of Union, if the obligations of a Government are not ended by a change of Ministry? If the obligations of a previous Government are not ended by a change of Ministry, why is the hon. member for West Durham, and the entire Opposition, trying to prevent the present Government from carrying out the Carnarvon Award that was made and accepted by the Government of their predecessors, of which the hon. member from Bothwell was a leading member? He says, that the Ontario Boundary Arbitrators gave the question their fullest consideration. So did the late Government the Carnarvon Award. Yet the hon. gentleman and his friends propose to reject that Award, if possible. Mr. Mills adds :

"To sanction the appointment of this Committee to seek to set aside the Award of these gentlemen, would be as great a wrong, as gross a breach of faith, as if one Administration of this country were to repudiate the public debt incurred by another Administration, or do anything which, in the public estimation, it is derogatory for a Government to do.

"I think this House ought not to grant this Committee; such a Committee cannot, without dishonour and bad faith, be appointed."

Now, what has been the whole course of the hon. member for West Durham? It has been, ever since 1873, an attempt to relax and repudiate the original Terms of Union. It is now to defeat, if possible, the attempt of this Government to fulfil the conditions of the Carnarvon Award. If it would be "a great wrong," "a gross breach of faith," to repudiate the act of a

former Go
the hon.
stop Rai
Columbia
"a great
faith." I
mittee to
nearly th
cannot be
bad faith
opposite
of "dish
attempt
of the
no hon.
Mills goe

"If the
trators we
incompeten
the res our
only with
and by c
proper ch
Committee
nothing bu
Award."

I am will
ing for
Union.
that purp
failed.
get the co
the Resol
West Du
men oppo
relaxatio
nise the
Award, t
to 1890 t
Pacific
They pr
obligatio
Province
revenues
and has
expects
obligatio
opposite
dered r
repudiate
It is q
state the
violated
quite in
from the
theirs;
fulfil th
Province
the who

former Government, what is the motion of the hon. member for West Durham to stop Railway construction in British Columbia, but an attempt to commit "a great wrong" and "a gross breach of faith." If the appointment of a Committee to enquire into a matter of which nearly the entire House is ignorant, cannot be made "without dishonour and bad faith," how can hon. gentlemen opposite free themselves from the charge of "dishonour and bad faith," when they attempt to repudiate the conditions of the Carnarvon Award, of which no hon. member is ignorant? Mr. Mills goes beyond this, and says:

"If the Government think that the Arbitrators were bribed, or that they were wholly incompetent men, then they ought to assume the responsibility of opening up the question, only with the consent of the other party,—and by obtaining information through the proper channels, instead of appointing a Committee,—a course which can lead to nothing but delay in the confirmation of the Award."

I am willing to concede the right of asking for a relaxation of the Terms of Union. The mission of Mr. Edgar for that purpose, however, as is well known, failed. What attempt has been made to get the consent of British Columbia to the Resolution of the hon. member for West Durham? None. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not propose to ask any relaxation. They will not even recognise the relaxation of the Carnarvon Award, that extended the time from 1881 to 1890 to complete the Railway from the Pacific Ocean to Lake Superior only. They propose to repudiate all railway obligations to British Columbia. That Province surrendered certain rights and revenues to the custody of the Dominion, and has fulfilled all her obligations, and expects the Dominion to perform her obligations. But hon. gentlemen opposite want to hold the surrendered rights and revenues, and repudiate the obligations they incurred. It is quite natural then for us to state that we have not, as a Province, violated our obligations; and it is also quite natural that we should exact from the Government a fulfilment of theirs; and if they are unprepared to fulfil their obligations, let them aid the Province in separating from the Union. The whole of British North America is

not yet consolidated. There is an outlying Province, Newfoundland, that is not within the Confederation; and how can we expect the Province of Newfoundland to enter a Dominion that has violated its solemn pledges over and over again. The bad faith of hon. gentlemen opposite tends to destroy all hope of the complete consolidation of British America. I will next take the utterances respecting the Boundary Award of the hon. gentleman who proposed the repudiation Resolution to-day. On page 72 of *Hansard*, this year, that hon. gentleman stated:

"A very great responsibility is assumed by that country, whatever its rank in the scale of nations, which declares it will not be bound by the results of a solemn convention."

"I esteem this in the same light as a convention between two different countries; for, as between Canada and Ontario, they are separate and distinct in this matter."

Now, Sir, if a very grave responsibility is assumed by a country that declares that it will not be bound by a solemn Convention, is there not a very grave responsibility assumed by the hon. member for West Durham, when he declares by his Resolution that Railway construction in British Columbia ought to be postponed? And if he could carry his Resolution, would he not force Canada to assume a very grave responsibility by declaring that she would not carry out the Carnarvon Award? He says that the relationship of Canada to Ontario is that of two different countries, so far as respects the Boundary Award. If that be true, Canada and Columbia are two different countries so far as the Terms of Union and the Carnarvon Award are concerned. And yet the hon. gentleman shows no hesitation in attempting to break that solemn Convention. If his position be correct respecting the Boundary Award, the stand that he has taken to-day in moving a Repudiation Resolution is totally indefensible, as it is calculated to cover this country with the infamy of attempting to break faith with one of the Provinces of this Confederation. Referring to the power of an Act of Parliament, to decide questions of boundary, Mr. Blake continued:

"But while that power exists, the question of international morality subsists also, and

what we have to consider is whether a case is here made out clearly sufficient to justify the procedure suggested to-day, based as that procedure is on a disregard of the Award as a cogent instrument.

"Now the first proposition I shall advance is that, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) well observed, there is a continuity in government.

"I say this question rests, with respect to the Government of the day, just in the same position as if the Government of the day had been responsible for the original commission. No hon. gentleman opposite can say that the present Government, or any of its supporters, are any the less bound than was the Government of my hon. friend from Lambton in reference to the issue of this commission and its consequences."

These are the utterances of the hon. gentleman who declared to-day, that he would not be bound by those solemn obligations to British Columbia. It will be observed that the hon. member for West Durham, in opposing the motion of the hon. gentleman for Algoma for a Committee to enquire into all matters respecting the Boundary of Ontario, said that there was "a question of international morality" to be considered. But, Sir, he has not questioned "international morality" in connection with his present motion. He assumes that the mere granting a Committee to enquire into matters connected with the Ontario Boundary raises "a question of international morality"; but he boldly undertakes to break faith with British Columbia, without ever touching on the moral aspect of the question. I take it, Sir, to be the duty of every hon. gentleman in this House to do all in his power to cause the Provinces to love each other, assist each other, and work together for the common good of our common country. But the course of the hon. gentleman is the very reverse. It is to induce the Provinces to hate each other. He says that the present Government is no less bound than the Government of the hon. member for Lambton for the issue of the Boundary Commission and its consequences. On the same principle the present Government is bound by the Carnarvon Award and its consequences; and yet the hon. gentleman repudiates the latter, and upholds the former. It is lamentable to see a public man occupying the position of the hon. gentleman reduced to so pitiable a condition. He also stated:

"My second proposition is that if it be

proposed not to ratify the Award, but to open the question again, and throw that instrument aside, such a proposal as that should be made upon the responsibility of the Government of the day, and with all the gravity which such a course of action demands."

Now, Sir, if this doctrine be true, the hon. gentleman, instead of moving a Repudiation Resolution, ought to have urged the Government to re-open the question of the construction of the Pacific Railway with British Columbia, and ought to have moved, "with all the gravity such a course of action demands." But the course adopted by the hon. gentleman is not statesmanlike; it is simply that of a man who has no regard for the undoubted rights of others. Why did not the hon. gentleman, when he was in the Government, endeavour to secure such modifications of the Carnarvon Award as would have satisfied both parties to the Award? All he did was to offer \$750,000 as compensation for all future delays that might take place respecting the construction of the Railway in British Columbia. That was very properly rejected; and there the hon. gentleman left the subject, till he came forward to repudiate entirely the work of construction. If any one, after this, can see anything statesmanlike, any capacity, in the hon. gentleman to keep the Provinces of this Confederacy together, they have better discernment than I possess. The hon. gentleman stated further:

"What a novel and entirely indefensible proposal it is, that a private member should take charge of this great material and moral question—moral as to whether a national award should be set aside, and material as to the extensive territory involved.

"It is the bounden duty of the Government itself, if disposed, to take steps, which in its opinion, the interest of the country requires—steps tending to the disturbance and upsetting of this Award,—so to state, frankly, itself, to propose those steps on its own responsibility, and justify its course."

The hon. member for West Durham here holds that it is a novel and entirely indefensible proposal that a private member should take charge of the great material and moral question of the Boundary Award; and yet, Sir, he, as a private member, comes forward to nullify the Carnarvon Award. To call such a course inconsistency would be to apply a mild term, for what in plain Saxon must be designated as a deliberate attempt to

commit
[Mr. J.
ment
debate.]
Mr. De
previous
by sayin
to do s
occasion
all the f
presente
bers of
We com
for Wes
sets him
this Ha
the pink
that is g
of this
sail on
dary del

"But r
sibility p
of dealing
dent of a
tario, I d
infinitely
its mater

Sir, the
Bounda
tant in
aspects,
ates not
Statute
sition s
the Aw
contrar
or any
Award
his hon
the vio
the sa
referre
said:

"I ha
gentlem
aside th
he thin
in anoth
culty in
been ex
settleme

"If
peror V
as just
as the
case.

"Th
right to
have to

commit a breach of public faith. [Mr. DeCosmos here by arrangement moved the adjournment of the debate.] On its resumption on Monday, Mr. DeCosmos gave a brief summary of the previous part of his speech, and concluded by saying: I do not believe it is desirable to do so at any length, as I shall take occasion, I hope, in another way to bring all the facts and conclusions that I then presented to this House, before the members of this Parliament and the country. We come, again, sir, to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), he who sets himself up more than anybody in this House, or in this Dominion, as the pink of morality, as the pink of all that is great, as an example to the people of this country. That hon. gentleman said on the occasion of the Ontario Boundary debate:—

"But my main proposition is, that the responsibility properly devolves on the Government of dealing with the question which, as a resident of and member from the Province of Ontario, I do not hesitate to declare I regard as infinitely more important in its moral than in its material aspect."

Sir, the man who could regard the Ontario Boundary Award as infinitely more important in its moral than in its material aspects, comes to this House and repudiates not only the Carnarvon Award but the Statute. The hon. the leader of the Opposition stated, through Lord Dufferin, that the Award was accepted—that it was not contrary to any Resolution of Parliament or any Statute, and that the Terms of the Award would be fulfilled; but we find his hon. colleague prepared to vote for the violation of that solemn compact. On the same occasion to which I have referred, the hon. member for Lambton said:

"I have no objection whatever to the hon. gentleman using his power in this House to set aside the legislation of the last Government if he thinks it wrong; but I fear if he were living in another country, he would find some difficulty in setting aside solemn treaties that have been entered upon: such as the Treaty for the settlement of the San Juan question."

"If the decision on that occasion of the Emperor William were to be set aside, it would be as justifiable from an international point of view as the setting aside of the Award in the present case."

"The hon. gentleman would have no more right to set aside the Award than he would have to set aside the Treaty of Washington."

These are the hon. gentleman's views who proposes to vote now with the hon. member for West Durham. He said in 1874 that the Carnarvon Award should not be broken, but he now wishes to repudiate the obligations made by himself with British Columbia. As it is not my intention to occupy the House long, I will quote from an authority which the other side of the House regard with reverence. On February 20th the *Globe* said this:

"It is bad enough for a Premier, who has not the moral courage to oppose something he does not want carried out, to shirk his responsibility and take shelter behind a Parliamentary Committee, but it is infinitely worse for him to be the means of making one of the parties to a solemn arbitration break faith with the other after an Award has been made. It is vain to say that the Dominion Government is not bound by the decision of the Arbitrators. If one Administration is not under obligation to carry out the engagements of its predecessor, what is the good faith of the country worth? As Mr. Blake put it in his speech, the moral considerations are in this instance far more important than the material interests at stake, though these are so considerable that we venture to predict a long and obstinate struggle before Ontario surrenders her present vantage ground."

Here we have the *Globe* and the three great lights of the Opposition, the hon. members for West Durham, Bothwell and Lambton, denouncing anything like breaking up of the Boundary Award and yet each of them is now prepared to vote against the Government of Canada attempting to keep faith with the Province of British Columbia, in the fulfilment of the Carnarvon Award. I have another extract to read, which I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will listen to. This is also from the *Globe*, of February 23rd:

"What is thought of a private man who refuses to accept the award of impartial arbitrators on his case? What was thought by the whole world of the United States journals that invited their Government to disregard the decision of the Halifax Commission? The mere objections of Secretary Evarts were held by the nations to have disgraced our neighbours in some degree. What if their Government had refused to pay the \$5,500,000, and had constituted a Committee of Congress to take the evidence over again and decide what should be done? What if the Cabinet of Mr. Hayes had refused to ratify the Award because the Halifax Commission had been determined on by their predecessors in office? But it may be said that an arbitration between independent nations is quite different from one between a federation and one of its parts, in as much as war might be the result of bad faith in the former

case. We hold that a disregard of obligation is rendered more disgraceful by the plea that it can be indulged in with safety. The stability of the Confederation depends on the general confidence of the Provinces in the central Government, and hereafter it will be impossible to respect the Administration at Ottawa while conducted by the leaders of the Tory party."

If the *Globe's* assertions be correct, that "a disregard of obligation is rendered more disgraceful by the plea that it can be indulged in with safety," then we must assume that the proposal of the hon. member for West Durham and his friends, to disregard the Carnarvon Award, is "disgraceful" indeed. I now come to the denunciations of a number of the members for Ontario in that journal, of which the following is a specimen:—

"The names of the Ontario members who voted for the national dishonour and feared to stand up for the just Award to their Province, are worthy of record. Let the electors of Ontario note the following list of men, who have at once been traitors to Canada and to their own constituents:

J. B. ROBINSON.	JOHN MCLENNAN.
R. HAY.	GEO. JACKSON.
S. FLATT.	T. S. SPROULE.
JOHN MCRORY.	WM. McDUGALL.
S. J. LAWSON.	F. E. KILVERT.
WM. FITZSIMMONS.	THOS. ROBERTSON.
ALEX. SHAW.	JOHN WHITE.
THOMAS WHITE.	MACKENZIE BOWELL.
JOHN ROCHESTER.	T. FARROW.
DARBY BERGIN.	R. STEPHENSON.
J. S. ROSE.	J. G. HAGGART.
A. T. H. WILLIAMS.	C. F. FERGUSON.
THOMAS ARKELL.	ED. HOOPER.
J. A. KIRKPATRICK.	J. C. RYKERT.
D. MACMILLAN.	T. COUGHLIN.
J. B. PLUMB.	W. WALLACE.
JOS. KEELER.	J. M. CURRIER.
S. R. HESSON.	J. TASE.
G. HILLIARD.	J. BURNHAM.
F. ROUTHIER.	J. S. MCQUAIG.
PETER WHITE.	DALTON MC'CARTHY.
W. C. LITTLE.	O. FULTON.
A. MCQUADE.	HECTOR CAMERON.
H. KRANZ.	S. MERNER.
G. A. DREW.	A. BOULTBEE.
	SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

This is what we find the hon. gentlemen opposite to have said and done through their organ the *Globe*. The very reverse they propose to do with respect to British Columbia, the only Province in the Dominion which has paid a larger sum into the Treasury than of right she should have paid. If Ontario members voted for the "national dishonour" when they simply voted for a Committee

to enquire into all matters connected with the Ontario Boundary, and if they were "traitors to Canada and their own constituents," will not hon. gentlemen opposite vote "for the national dishonour," and prove "traitors to Canada and their constituents," when they vote for the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham to break the Carnarvon Award? But I will now read some passages from a writer on International Law, for the benefit of the member for West Durham, who presents himself here in the character of an international law-breaker, whose moral instincts are so readily touched when anything concerns Ontario, but who is deaf and insensible when British Columbia is concerned, and when she asks for justice. I will read some passages from Vattel, a standard authority on International Law, as Blackstone is on Common Law, and Adam Smith on Political Economy:

"It is a settled point in natural law, that he who has made a promise to any one has conferred upon him a real right to require the thing promised,—and, consequently, that the breach of a perfect promise is a violation of another person's right, and as evidently an act of injustice as it would be to rob a man of his property. The tranquility, the happiness, the security of the human race, wholly depend on justice,—on the obligation of paying a regard to the rights of others. The respect which others pay to our rights of domain and property constitutes the security of our actual possessions; the faith of promises is our security for things that cannot be delivered or executed upon the spot. There would no longer be any security, no longer any commerce between mankind, if they did not think themselves obliged to keep faith with each other, and to perform their promises. This obligation is, then, as necessary as it is natural and indubitable, between nations that live together in a state of nature, and acknowledge no superior upon earth, to maintain order and peace in their society. Nations, therefore, and their conductors, ought inviolably to observe their promises and their treaties. This great truth, though too often neglected in practice, is generally acknowledged by all nations: the reproach of perfidy is esteemed by sovereigns as most atrocious affront; yet he who does not observe a treaty is certainly perfidious, since he violates his faith. On the contrary, nothing adds so great a glory to a prince, and to the nation he governs, as the reputation of an inviolable fidelity in the performance of promises. By such honourable conduct, as much and even more than by her valour, the Swiss nation has rendered herself respectable throughout Europe, and is deservedly courted by the greatest monarchs who entrust their personal safety to a body-guard of her citizens. The Parliament of England has more than once thanked the king

for his fidelity of his crown the source of his power, and of power

"As the on the o produce breach of the perfe have con against h

It remain the men with his Govern compact gain bet which c honours obligati the Min broken the sta Bothwe be brok parties the sub

"Wh number sacred l portant pretensi them na ment of dearest tween s on earl ing the fixed r they ar to depe empty as resp are to and hel "Th resolut ing our fession sacred the ea and, i their c the po "H the sa regard the la as dep effect to h all na societ execu ereign

for his fidelity and zeal in succouring the allies of his crown. This national magnanimity is the source of immortal glory; it presents a firm basis on which nations may build their confidence, and thus it becomes an unfailing source of power and splendour.

"As the engagements of a Treaty imposed on the one hand a perfect obligation, they produce on the other a perfect right. The breach of a Treaty is therefore a violation of the perfect right of the party with whom we have contracted; and this is an act of injustice against him."

It remains, then, for history to state, that the member for West Durham bargained with his colleagues and the leader of his Government to violate the Treaty and compact with British Columbia—the bargain between her, Canada and England, which every honourable Province and honourable man would say was a binding obligation—and that he would only enter the Ministry on condition it should be broken; and yet we have had, this Session, the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that no Treaty can be broken except with the consent of both parties to it. I will read this passage on the subject:

"Who can doubt that Treaties are in the number of those things that are to be held sacred by nations? By treaties the most important affairs are determined; by them the pretensions of sovereigns are regulated; on them nations are to depend for the acknowledgment of their rights, and the security of their dearest interests. Between bodies politic,—between sovereigns who acknowledge no superior on earth, treaties are the only means of adjusting their various pretensions,—of establishing fixed rules of conduct,—of ascertaining what they are entitled to expect, and what they have to depend on. But treaties are no better than empty words, if nations do not consider them as respectable engagements,—as rules which are to be inviolably observed by sovereigns, and held sacred throughout the whole earth.

"The faith of treaties, that firm and sincere resolution, that invariable constancy in fulfilling our engagements,—of which we make profession in a treaty, is therefore to be held sacred and inviolable between the nations of the earth, whose safety and repose is secured: and, if mankind be not wilfully deficient in their duty to themselves, infamy must ever be the portion of him who violates his faith.

"He who violates his treaties, violates at the same time the law of nations: for, he disregards the faith of treaties,—that faith which the law of nations declares sacred; and, so far as depends on him, he renders it vain and ineffectual. Doubly guilty, he does an injury to his ally, he does an injury to all nations, and inflicts a wound on the great society of mankind. "On the observance and execution of treaties," said a respectable sovereign, "depends all the security which princes

and states have with respect to each other: and no dependence could henceforth be placed in future conventions if the existing ones were not to be observed."

"As all nations are interested in maintaining the faith of treaties, and causing it to be everywhere considered as sacred and inviolable, so likewise they are justifiable in forming a confederacy for the purpose of repressing him who testifies a disregard for it—who openly sports with it—who violates and tramples it under foot. Such a man is a public enemy who saps the foundations of the peace and common safety of nations. But we should be careful not to extend this maxim to the prejudice of that liberty and independence to which every nation has a claim. When a sovereign breaks his treaties, or refuses to fulfil them, this does not immediately imply that he considers them as empty names, and that he disregards the faith of treaties; he may have good reasons for thinking himself liberated from his engagements; and other sovereigns have not a right to judge him. It is the sovereign who violates his engagements on pretences that are evidently frivolous, or who does not even think it worth his while to allege any pretence whatever, to give a colourable gloss to his conduct, and cast a veil over his want of faith—it is such a sovereign who deserves to be treated as an enemy to the human race."

The hon. member for West Durham proposes delay, and every hon. member can perceive that his conclusions are at variance with his statements and premises. But he is the man of subtleties and flimsy reasons, in order that the Treaty with British Columbia may not be carried out. *Vattel*, page 234, speaking of subtleties says:

"His Catholic Majesty, Ferdinand, having concluded a treaty with the Archduke, his son-in-law, thought he could evade it by privately protesting against the treaty: a puerile finesse! which without giving any right to that prince, only exposed his weakness and duplicity."

Now, what applies to Ferdinand will apply to hon. gentlemen opposite. This resolution has only again exposed their weakness and their duplicity. I quote again from *Vattel* on Treaties, page 450, and I ask the House to observe its applicability to the course of the hon. member for West Durham. As is well known, the hon. gentleman has ever been in favour of delays in connection with the fulfilment of Canada's obligations to British Columbia. Now, what does this great writer on International Law say about delays? He says:

"Studied delays are equivalent to an express denial, and differ from it only by the artifice with which he who practices them seeks to palliate his want of faith; he adds fraud to

perfidy, and actually violates the article which he should fulfil."

Sir, I am astonished that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House can support so perfidious a resolution as that of the hon. member for West Durham. I am astonished that the hon. gentleman himself should wish to cover his country with such infamy, as must cover every state that breaks its treaties. If war be the sum of villainies, the breaking of treaties must be the sum of infamies. My hon. friend, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, stated the other night that the Union of the four Provinces was based upon the construction of a Railway connecting the Eastern with the Western Provinces. Without the Intercolonial Railway there could have been and would have been no real Union. Now, suppose that after that Union had been proclaimed, after the Federal Government had been organised, and the several Provinces had begun to pay their money into the Federal Treasury, that the Dominion had refused to construct that road, would not every man from those Eastern Provinces have denounced the Federal Government for its perfidy? But, when such a course is actually proposed to be pursued towards British Columbia, many hon. gentlemen seem not to understand that equal perfidy is involved in the proposition to break faith with British Columbia. Now, we will take the Carnarvon Award. The leader of the Opposition, while head of the late Government, and Lord Dufferin, concurred in accepting the Award, and thanking Lord Carnarvon for what he had done. And they added this: We accept this for a present settlement, as it is not at variance with any statute. We accept it because it is not at variance with any Resolution of Parliament. What duplicity on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, who deliberately, down to the present hour, are still prepared to implement that Award by supporting a proposition to ignore it. The hon. the Minister of Railways has brought under the notice of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the late Premier did not propose to build the Emory-Savona section of the Pacific Railway, although he put this country to an expense of thousands of dollars in moving rails. What greater infamy can we conceive of if this charge be true? When knowingly and

deliberately using the public money of Canada for a mere partisan purpose, he wasted \$32,000 to make the people of British Columbia believe that the Government intended to build the road, whilst in fact they did not intend to do so.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I made a mistake in the amount; it was over \$34,000.

MR. DECOSMOS: I thank the hon. gentleman for his correction. I think it will also be found that the late Government, in order to provide themselves with a means of escape, did not pass any Order in Council calling for tenders. I believe the call for tenders was put into the papers, and no Order in Council, authorizing the call, was ever passed. In 1871 the Government of Canada, with a full sense of their obligations, made a Treaty with British Columbia. The obligations of that Treaty put a first lien upon this Dominion after the charges upon the public debt and the ordinary and current expenditure for government. Under that Treaty the Railway was to be commenced simultaneously on the Pacific coast and at some point east of the Rocky Mountains. Fifteen million dollars have already been expended by the late Government in the work of construction, and not a single dollar has been spent in British Columbia in the work of construction. Is it not right that the Parliament now, at the end of seven years, from the time fixed for its commencement, should fill, in a small measure, the obligations assumed in 1871? Again, about \$15,000,000 has been expended on the canal system since 1873. We find the system of canals between Lake Huron and Montreal have cost over \$15,000,000, and the interest that is being paid, at the rate of 5 per cent., amounts to \$750,000 more per annum. If this Government had wished to have kept faith with the people of British Columbia, it would not have entered so readily into the enlargement of canals, because the obligations to British Columbia was a prior lien on this Dominion.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. DECOSMOS: More than that! We find that they have relieved the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec of some \$600,000 or \$700,000 a year interest, or nearly \$11,000,000 in capital. Making a total expenditure of principal and interest of about \$50,000,000 in nine years, contrary to the spirit and letter of the com-

pact with
that any
referred w
Dominion
British C
that in th
opposite.
address of
ber for
Speech f
House.
I took gr
sion agai
selected
contrary
on this p
ernment
on the
that I r
dissatisfi
I made
seen on
question
"the f
ferred to
object o
subject,
which th
prepared
district
which I
to place
ances o
will sh
Kamloo
which t
contract
area in
Commo
nay, is

Yale an
Lytton
Cache C
Kamloo
Nicola
Okanag
Rock C

Contai
distrib

Yale an
Lytton
Cache C
Kamloo
Nicola
Okanag
Rock C

In al

money of purpose, he people of the Gov- ad, whilst so. I made a was over

hon. gen- ak it will ment, in means of Council e call for , and no the call, Govern- se of their British at Treaty after the the ordi- r govern- ilway was y on the east of the llion dol- ended by work of ollar has ia in the ight that of seven mence- sure, the Again, expended We find e Huron 000,000, d, at the 3750,000 overnment with the ould not enlarge- ations to a on this

fact with British Columbia. I take it that anyone to whom this matter may be referred will see that the first duty of the Dominion was to fulfil its obligation with British Columbia, but we hear nothing of that in the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite. I desire now to allude to the address of my hon. friend the hon. member for Yale, when the reply to the Speech from the Throne was before the House. The hon. gentleman stated that I took ground in my speech on that occasion against the route of the railway selected by the government. The very contrary: I expressed myself as follows on this point: "I am glad that the government has at last decided upon a route on the West Coast." He, also, stated that I represented the people as being dissatisfied with the route selected. Now, I made no such statement,—as will be seen on reference to the *Hansard*. He questioned my remarks with relation to "the fertile district of Kamloops," referred to in the Speech. Now with the object of placing myself right on that subject, and correcting the error into which the hon. member has fallen, I have prepared some statistics on Kamloops district and the neighboring districts, which I will ask the House to allow me to place among other reports of my utterances on this occasion. These statistics will show the extent approximately of Kamloops and contiguous districts, from which the section of railway, now under contract, will get its business. The total area in square miles and acreage in Yale Commons district, exclusive of Kootenay, is:

	Square miles.	Acres.
Yale and Hope districts...	3,300	2,112,000
Lytton	2,200	1,518,000
Cache Creek	1,200	768,000
Kamloops	4,500	2,880,000
Nicola	3,600	2,304,000
Okanagan	2,700	1,728,000
Rock Creek	2,325	1,488,000
	19,825	12,798,000

Containing in 1879 the following polling districts, voters and farmers:—

	Voters.	Farm's.
Yale and Hope polling district....	67	13
Lytton district	51	23
Cache Creek	56	26
Kamloops	126	58
Nicola	54	54
Okanagan	70	63
Rock Creek	15	2
	452	239

In all the sub-districts, giving the 239

farmers 320 acres each, the total acreage of the farms would be 66,480 acres; while in the ten settlements in the Kamloops district the 58 farmers at 320 acres each, the total acreage would be only 18,560 acres. North of Yale district is Lilloet district (a sub-district of Cariboo Commons district), the total area of which is 18,000 square miles, or a total acreage of 11,520,000 acres. The total acreage in occupation is: 83 farmers, at 320 acres each, 26,000 acres, the total voters being 108. In 1874 the list of voters stood:

	Total Voters.	Farmers.	Stock-raisers.
Yale and Hope.....	54	12	Nil.
Lytton.....	30	10	"
Nicola.....	43	40	"
Okanagan.....	58	9	"
Kamloops.....	87	36	6
Cache Creek.....	27	17	Nil.

The total lands taken up in 1878 in Kamloops was 8,160 acres, in quantities from 36 to 640 acres. The following statement will show the increase of farmers in the above districts during the period between 1874 and 1878:—

	1874	1878	Increase.
Hope and Yale, farmers ...	12	13	1
Lytton,	10	23	13
Cache Creek,	17	26	9
Kamloops,	36	50	14
Okanagan,	9	61	52
Nicola,	40	54	14

The following is a summary of the Yale and Lilloet districts:

Yale, total square miles.....	19,825
Lilloet,	18,000
Total	37,825
Yale, total acres.....	12,798,000
Lilloet,	11,520,000
Total acreage.....	24,318,000
Total voters, Yale.....	452
" " Lilloet	108
Total voters.....	550
Total farmers, Yale.....	239
" " Lilloet	83
Total farmers.....	322

I will not on this occasion enter upon an estimate of the amount of business that the railway may transact with these districts—as way traffic. I will say this, that with respect to the railway that is proposed to be built by the Government, that whilst I do not believe that the Fraser is the best route for our trans-continental railway, yet at the same time I am wholly indisposed to be factious. The

Government have arrived at a decision, and I am prepared to support the Government in their decision to build that section of the road. I believe, however, that the Pine Pass route will yet prove to be the great through route. I believe that after this section is built it will enable the whole of British Columbia to be opened up, by connecting the Pine Pass route through British Columbia with the Yale—Kamloop section, via Fort George, Quesnelle, Clinton and Cache Creek. To benefit the Western Province, the railway ought to start at Cache Creek, and go on to Fort George; that would be the means of opening up the entire interior of the Province of Columbia. My hon. friend from Yale, also stated, on the occasion to which I have previously alluded, that there were not twelve persons in my constituency who were opposed to the Fraser route. Allow me to state, that that was an incorrect statement. He also stated that, in an eloquent speech, I spoke in favour of that section. At that time we had no terms of Union with Canada. We were not even within the Confederation, and the question of a railway across the continent, was an unsettled one. The question was put to our Legislative Council, of which I was a member, and of which my hon. friend was a member at that time. The statement was made that we might get a trans-continental railway, if Canada accepted our terms. I said then, that if we were going to have a railway, it would be better to put in a positive provision, that it shall be constructed between Yale and Savona's Ferry. I believe that this route will be valuable to this country, and I believe that the territory south of Kamloops, which is nearly five times as large as the Province of Prince Edward Island, and that in the districts to the north and south of Kamloops, some very fine country, can be opened up. As far as Kamloops is concerned, I do not believe very much traffic can be obtained. My hon. friend opposite, does not want anything to be built in the way of a railway in British Columbia, until the settler has reached the Rocky Mountain Range. I think the hon. gentleman is labouring under a very great mistake indeed. He has to know that there is only one great commercial mart on the Pacific coast, and that that great commercial mart is San Francisco; that it has formed commercial relations with every people, on

the west coast of America, the east coast of Asia, the Indian Archipelago, down through Australia and New Zealand. Now, I take it, if we wish as a Canadian people, if we wish to establish a foreign policy, if we wish to find a market for our surplus products, we ought to have railway communication with the shores of the Pacific, in order that we might distribute our surplus goods among the markets of the Pacific Ocean. The hon. member for West Durham wants delay. That is a great mistake; for the sooner we are enabled to move our manufactures across the continent, and enter into commercial rivalry around the shores of the Pacific Ocean with our neighbour to the south, the sooner we will be enabled to occupy a similar commanding commercial position to the provinces on the Atlantic. Allow me to call the attention of the House to the trade of the port of San Francisco. The total imports of merchandise during 1879, in San Francisco, amounted to \$34,124,417. The total exports, \$36,564,328. I find that the domestic exports from the State of California amounted to \$29,000,000. Now the total value of the imports of Canada in 1878-79 was \$31,964,427; and total value of exports, \$71,491,255. By comparison, it will be seen, that San Francisco, a city only thirty years old, imports and exports nearly half as much, exclusive of coin and bullion, as the Dominion of Canada. Now there is no good reason why this state of things should exist, if we are true to ourselves, and develop by railway the Great West. A few years ago, I employed an engineer to make a measurement of our territory from the 110th meridian, west, to the eastern boundary of British Columbia, and between the 49th and 60th parallels of north latitude. The result showed that there are 257,000 square miles of territory east of the Provincial boundary that must find its market through a port in British Columbia. That added to the 330,000 square miles of British Columbia gives us a territory of 587,000 square miles, which must also find its chief markets on the coast of the Pacific. The United States, west of the 110th meridian and between the Canadian boundary and the Republic of Mexico, have 800,000 square miles of territory, and we have just as good a country as they have. The agricultural products of

Canada send
England in
twenty mil
exports of
of San Fran
788,772.
railway ru
east of the
short dist
we will be
to England
cisco. We
this railwa
region east
this throug
railway wi
up the cou
further.
facts from
this subj
import an
Province,
tributed
in Custom
as, at the
been pay
buted mon
on Friday
as much
Columbia
Quebecer
forty Nov
bians pa
Brunswic
bians pa
Prince E
British C
dated Fu
she was
per capi
showed
from 187
in Cust
But let
compari
rately, a
the Dom
per capi
is the a
to pay,
we shou
altogeth
\$346,34
which v
we do n
Canada
front a
the be
populat

Canada sent from the Atlantic side to England in 1878-79 were worth about twenty millions of dollars. Now, the exports of wheat alone, from the port of San Francisco, last year were \$16,788,772. I maintain that if we have a railway running from the cereal region east of the Rocky Mountains to within a short distance of the Pacific coast, that we will be just as able to ship our wheat to England as the people of San Francisco. We trust also to find a way traffic for this railway. By the settlement of that region east of our boundary, we will get this through traffic and by that means the railway will assist most materially to build up the country. I shall not go into detail further. I desire now to summarize a few facts from what I have already said upon this subject. We, British Columbia, import and export more than any other Province, *per capita*. We have contributed during the last year \$521,443 in Customs alone to the Revenue, whereas, at the same rate per head as we have been paying Ontario, would have contributed more than \$20,000,000. I contended on Friday night that 200 Ontarians paid as much as five Columbians; that five Columbians paid as much as 150 Quebecers; five Columbians paid as much forty Nova Scotians; that five Columbians paid as much as thirty New Brunswickers; and that five Columbians paid 150 per cent. more than ten Prince Edward Islanders. I showed that British Columbia paid into the Consolidated Fund last year \$275,762 more than she was lawfully bound to pay at the *per capita* rate of the Dominion. I showed that during the eight years, from 1871 to 1879, she paid in a total, in Customs and Excise, of \$3,392,152. But let us leave out of consideration the comparison with the Provinces separately, and come down to the average for the Dominion. Our proportion of Customs per capita of the Dominion is \$3.50; that is the amount per capita which we ought to pay, and, as our population is 50,000, we should by right contribute \$175,000 altogether; but the fact is we paid \$346,343 in addition to the \$175,000 which we should not pay by right. Yet we do not grumble. All we want is the Canadian Government to come to the front and carry out their obligations in the best possible way. The 50,000 population is based upon careful calcula-

tions. During the six months preceding my arrival here I gave a great deal of attention to the matter, and I came to the conclusion that, including our Indian population, our white population and the Chinese and every other nationality the number, our population, in the maximum, is 50,000. Now, it has been stated that \$1,449,956 has been expended on surveys in British Columbia, and as British Columbia has contributed, man for man, the large amount which I have stated more *per capita* than all the rest of the Dominion, it will be seen that over and above all railway expenditure, the Government hold in hand a net balance contributed in the eight years by British Columbia, over the remainder of the Dominion, of \$195,540. I am glad to see the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) in his seat; because I want to make reference to his statement, at Walkerton, that we had only a population of 2,000.

MR. BLAKE: No, no.

MR. DECOSMOS: The hon. gentleman stated that there were about as great a population in British Columbia as in the audience he was then addressing at Walkerton, and that audience was about 2,000 in number. I have it here in the *Globe*.

MR. BLAKE: I neither swear by, nor at the *Globe*; but what I really stated, was that the population numbered as many freeholders as the number then present; and I estimated the freeholders as one to five.

MR. DECOSMOS: Oh! freeholders. The hon. member for West Durham is well able to make that look better which looked so much worse. He stated that there were only 2,000 freeholders in British Columbia. I find also that he gives 12,000 paying \$553,362 in Excise and Customs in one year; that would be about \$47 per capita. Oh! I wish I were such a statistician as the hon. member for West Durham. I told the House the other night that I would deal with the Vancouver section of the railway at some other time. I know it will be built. I am only dealing with the Yale-Kamloops section; the total cost of which I estimate at \$8,000,000. I have shown that we pay \$340,000 a year more in Customs than the average taxation of the Dominion, and, therefore, we really shall pay all the expenses, in the shape of interest and sinking fund for the building of this railway.

ERRATA:

- Page 2, line 82, for "Lake and Water" read "lake and canal."
 Page 6, line 29 (below table), for "in British Columbia" read "if British Columbia."
 Page 11, in table of "Casual and Territorial Revenue," in column headed "1874-5," for "4.11" read "12,264.11;" for "5.12" read "2,975.12;" for "9.18" read "9,489.18."
 Page 11, second column, for "nearly \$1,750,000" read "is nearly \$1,750,000."
 Page 12, second column, line 6, for "beyond the statutory provision of" read "beyond the statutory provision."
 Page 16, second column, 3rd line from bottom, for "on that side of the House" read "in this House."

British

headed
" for

000."
read

ouse "